DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 265 CS 506 131

AUTHOR Walker, James R.
TITLE Time Out: The Viewing Experience and Reactions to the 1987 NFL Players' Strike.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (38th, New Orleans, LA, May 29-June 2, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Athletics; *Audience Analysis; Broadcast Television; Mass Media Effects; News Media; Popular Culture; *Strikes; Television Research; *Television Viewing; Transactional Analysis; Union Members; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS *Media Gratifications; *National Football League; Professional Sports

ABSTRACT

The 1987 NFL players' strike provided an opportunity to evaluate the importance of media gratification and viewing involvement in the development of audience reactions to a major sports labor conflict that produced gratification denial. Two groups of viewers of professional football--183 adult males in the Memphis, Tennessee area, interviewed by telephone, and 339 undergraduates at Memphis State University--responded to a questionnaire. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to evaluate the relative importance of general background, general foreground, media reference background, and media reference foreground variables in accounting for variations in viewer reactions to the strike. Results provide partial support for the application of the general transactional model to studies of sports and media. For both groups, media reference foreground variable blocks were significantly related to strike saliency and perceptions of future football viewing. However, general background and foreground variables, particularly race and support for labor unions, were more strongly related to support for the players or the owners--blacks and union supporters were more likely to support the players, while union opponents were more likely to support the owners. Greater degrees of gratifications sought and viewing involvement made viewers perceive both the strike and future viewing as consequential, but did not persuade them to choose one side over the other. (Eight notes four tables are included and 24 references are appended.) (Author/MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James R Walker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED294265

Time Out:
The Viewing Experience and Reactions to the 1987 NFL Players' Strike

James R. Walker
143 Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152, USA
901-454-2565

A paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA, May 29-June 2, 1988.

CS506131

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The 1987 NFL players' strike provided a rare opportunity to evaluate the importance of media gratifications and viewing involvement in the development of audience reactions to a major sports labor conflict that produced gratification denial. Two groups of professional football viewers were studied: 183 adult males interviewed by telephone and 339 university students. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to evaluate the relative importance of general background, general foreground, media reference background, and media reference foreground variables in accounting for variations in viewer reactions to the strike. As expected, media reference foreground variables, including both media gratifications and viewing involvement variables, were significantly related to the saliency of the strike and expectations about future viewing. However, general background and foreground variables, particularly race and support for labor unions, were more strongly related to support for the players or the owners. Greater degrees of gratifications sought and viewing involvement made viewers perceive both the strike and future viewing as consequential, but did not persuade them to choose one side over the other.

Introduction

The 1987 strike by the National Football League Players Association was a near disaster for the union. The players' union struck on September 21 and remained on strike until October 15, when they suspended the strike in favor of legal action against the NFL. Despite huge losses in player salaries, the strike produced no tangible owner concessions. Even more destructive was the parade of player defections that pushed the union to retreat and threatened to break it. However, considering the declining fortunes of organized labor in the United States (Engel, 1985; Kovach, 1985; Woodworth, 1985) and the support of the owners expressed by many fans (Lieber, 1987: 42), the outcome of the strike could have been forecast with at least the same accuracy as most regular season games.

Nevertheless, a sports story of the magnitude of the NFL Players' Strike provides an excellent chance to study the relationship between the gratifications sought from televised sports and fan reactions. During a strike, viewers must adjust to the denial of gratification while developing attitudes about the source of that denial. Regular viewers of NFL games were likely to develop positions quickly in response to the strike. Naive speculation would suggest that fans seeking the strongest gratifications from viewing professional football would be the most likely to turn against the perceived instigators of the strike: the players. However, attitudes toward organized labor, as well as ideological and demographic characteristics are also likely to influence the reactions of NFL viewers.

Although the impact of sports has received considerable attention in sociology and related fields, media researchers have produced only a handful of studies of the audience for mediated sports. This limited body of research has focused on six topics: selective perception of a sports event (Hastorf & Cantril, 1954), the impact sports commentary (Bryant, Brown, Comisky, & Zillmann, 1982; Comisky, Bryant, & Zillmann, 1977), violence in sports (Bryant & Zillmann, 1983; Celozzi, Kazelskis, & Gutsch, 1981), exposure to televised sports and political values (Prisuta, 1979), social conditions of viewing (Sapolsky & Zillmann, 1978; Zillmann, Bryant, & Sapolsky, 1977)), and motivations or gratifications sought for viewing (Gantz, 1981).

Considering the intense interest in media gratifications research (Palmgreen, Wenner, & Rosengren, 1985) and the explosive growth in televised sports (Head & Sterling, 1987: 326), the limited number of gratification studies seems especially puzzling. Wenner (1987) argues that the uses and gratifications approach to media studies has much to contribute to our understanding of the effects of mediated sports, suggesting that "the variants and degree of gratification experienced by the audience member will likely play a modifying role in the effects that mediated sport will have" (p. 26). Wenner's claim seems rooted in an earlier general media gratifications model (Palmgreen et al., 1985) which postulates that gratifications sought lead to communicative behavior (both mediated and non-mediated), producing perceptions of gratifications obtained as well as other cognitive, affective, and behavioral consequences.

Thus, researchers interested in the effects of any type of media content should examine carefully how the motivations for consumption are related to those effects.

Research on the linkage between media gratifications and media effects is well established in the literature. The most recent comprehensive review of media gratifications research identified over 20 "uses and effects" studies (Palmgreen et al., 1985). According to the editors,

> these studies have shown that a variety of audience gratifications . . . are related to a wide spectrum of media effects, including knowledge, dependency, attitudes, perceptions of social reality, agenda-setting, discussion, and various political effects variables. (p. 31)

Although early uses and effects studies tended to be atheoretical, Blumler (1979: 18-19) developed three hypotheses concerning kinds of effects produced by particular gratifications sought. Blumler predicted that cognitive motives "will facilitate information gain," diversion and escape motives "will favour audience acceptance of perceptions of social situations in line with portrayals frequently found in entertainment materials," and personal identity motives are "likely to promote reinforcement effects." However, Palmgreen et al. (1985) have concluded that only the first of these hypotheses had been, at that time, supported by research.

In addition to the broadly defined general media gratifications model, a more focused model of the gratifications/effects process has been advanced by Wenner

(1985). After tracing the philosophic roots of transaction (Dewey and Bentley, 1949) and identifying its evolution in both the physical and social sciences, Wenner proposes that the use of transactional models in media gratifications research can serve as a useful guide to the hierarchical ordering of media effects predictors. His general transactional model identifies four general sets of media effects predictors that might be included in media effects studies: general background, general foreground, media reference background, and media reference foreground variables.

The individual's general background includes the "social and psychological needs and values" usually accounted for by demographic variables. General foreground "includes those less well-entrenched aspects of the individual that do not pertain to the area under investigation," including attitudes related to, but not about, particular effects. Media reference background includes "habitual media exposure" as well as exposure to non-media sources of need satisfaction. Media reference foreground includes "gratifications sought, modified by media content and the context of exposure, and resulting in gratifications obtained" (Wenner, 1985: 90-92). Wenner argues that studies of the gratifications and effects should be hierarchically arranged, starting with general background variables, then including general foreground variables, media reference background variables, and finally media reference foreground variables.

In this study, the general transactional model has been applied to reactions to the 1987 NFL players' strike. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to evaluate the relative importance of general background, general foreground, media reference background, and media rererence foreground variables in accounting ror variations in the saliency of the strike, support ror the players or the owners, and perceptions or the strike's impact on future viewing. To make rull use of previous sports viewing gratifications research, the concept or media reference foreground variables were expanded to include both gratifications sought and behavioral responsiveness measures developed by Gantz (1981), as well as the saliency of televised professional football.

Previous gratifications theory and research suggests that:

H1: Media reference foreground variables will account for significant variation in viewer reactions to the NFL players' strike even after the impact of general background, general foreground, and media reference background variables has been accounted for.

Method

Samples and Procedures

Two groups of professional football viewers[1] were sampled: 183 adult males[2] interviewed by telephone and 339 undergraduates at Memphis State University. The adult males were randomly selected from the residential listings in the most recent Memphis, TN telephone directory, using a procedure outlined by Frey (1983: 64-65). To lower the refusal rate, an introductory

letter was mailed to each household, before telephone contact, explaining the nature of the study. Four attempts were made to contact each household before that household was dropped from the sample. Once the household was contacted, alternating requests were made for the youngest and oldest males over the age of 18 (Frey, 1983: 83). Respondents who never watch televised professional football were not interviewed. The refusal rate for those adult males contacted who watch televised professional football was 30%. The sample was 78.7% White, with a mean age of 42.3 years and a mean of 14.5 years of education. The median annual household income was between $30,000 and $40,000. Trained graduate students conducted the interviews, which lasted approximately 12 minutes. Most interviews were conducted on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday nights between 6:30 and 9:30 PM. Interviews were conducted during the two weeks that followed the conclusion of the strike (October 19-31, 1987).[3]

Seventy-five percent of the undergraduate respondents were students in public speaking classes, and 25% were enrolled in a variety of other communication and theater courses. After a brief set of instructions were read by course instructors, a modified version of the telephone interview questionnaire was self-administered. Questionnaires were completed in class during the week of October 26, 1987. Four students provided substantially incomplete data and were not included in the data analyses. The sample was 44.3% female and 80.7% White, with a mean age of 21.5 years. The median annual household income was between $40,000 and $60,000.

Data analyses were performed separately on each sample. The SPSSX statistical package was used for all computations.

Predictor Variables Blocks

General Background Variables. For the adult respondents, demographic variables included age, years of formal education, race, and household income.[4] For the undergraduates, the demographic variables were age, sex, race, and household income.

General Foreground Variables. To measure ideology, respondents identified themselves as a strong liberal, a liberal, a moderate, a conservative, or a strong conservative. To measure support for labor unions, respondents indicated if they were a strong opponent of labor unions, an opponent of labor unions, neutral about labor unions, a supporter of labor unions, or a strong supporter of labor unions.

Media Reference Background Variables. Television exposure was measured by summing two proportionally weighted items: one measuring the number of hours watched during a typical weekday and one measuring the number of hours watched during a typical weekend day. Professional football viewing was measured using one item. Respondents indicated if they watched a game less than once a month, once a month, once every two or three weeks, once a week, more than once a week.

Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Involvement. To measure saliency of televised professional football, respondents indicated if viewing was, for them, not at all important, not very important, somewhat important, or very important. Six

behavioral responsiveness items adapted from Gantz (1981) were summed to produce the measure of viewing activity.[5] For each item, respondents indicated if they never, seldom, sometimes, or often engaged in that activity when they watched a televised professional football game. The items were: talk about the football action, dispute an official's call, applaud or yell in pleasure, yell in displeasure, pace the floor, and dispute the tactics of the head coach. The Cronbach's Alphas for the six items were .78 for the adult male and .87 for undergraduate respondents.

Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Gratifications Sought. Fourteen gratifications for watching televised professional football were adapted from Gantz (1981).[6] Respondents indicated if each gratification was not at all important, not very important, somewhat important, or very important to them. Following the procedures used by Gantz (1981), principal factor with iterations analyses were performed using the 14 gratification items. Eigenvalue minimums of 1.0 and varimax rotations were used to extract the final factors. A gratification was attributed to a factor if it had a loading of at least .4 and did not exceed half its highest loading on any other factor.[7]

-----Table 1 about here-----

The analysis of the adult males produced a four factor solution which accounted for 47.1% of the variance. For the adult males, three of the four general sports gratification dimensions identified by Gantz (1981) emerged: watching to

thrill in victory, watching to learn, and watching to pass time. The other factor included gratifications involving socializing with family and friends.

The undergraduate analysis created a three factor solution which accounted for 46.6% of the variance. Two of Gantz's four dimensions emerged: watching to pass time and watching to let loose. The other factor combined the other two of Gantz's dimensions: watching to thrill in victory and watching to learn.

Viewing gratification variables (four for the adults and three for the undergraduates) were created from the items loading on each factor. The items loading on each factor were multiplied by their loadings and then summed to produce each viewing gratification variable.

Criterion Variables

Strike Saliency. Strike saliency was measured using one item. Respondents indicated if the strike was not at all important, not very important, somewhat important, or very important to them.

Player/Owner Support. A player/owner support scale was constructed from ten five-point Likert items: one positive and four negative statements about the players and two positive and three negative statements about the owners.[8] The items were developed from a review of fan reactions reported in the Memphis daily newspaper ("NFL fans," 1987; "Strike prompts," 1987). Responses were coded so that a low score reflected support for the players and a high score support for the owners. They were then converted to z-scores and summed to create a scale

with ten equally weighted items. The Cronbach's Alphas for the ten items were .79 for the adult males and .88 for the undergraduates.

Future Football Viewing. Future viewing of televised football was measured using one five-point Likert item. Respondents indicated if they were through watching professional football on television as a result of the strike.

Results

Predictors of Strike Saliency

The hierarchical regressions reported in Table 2 indicate that media reference foreground variables, entered after the other variables blocks, were the strongest predictors of strike saliency.

-----Table 2 about here-----

For the adult males, the viewing involvement block accounted for 12.8% of the variance and the viewing gratifications block accounted for an additional 6.9%. The only other significant block--demographic variables--accounted for 11.7%. The strongest strike saliency correlations were positive relationships with saliency of viewing professional football (r = .45), viewing professional football to learn about the game (r = .39), and race (r = .31).

For the undergraduates, the viewing involvement block accounted for 20.2% of the variance, the viewing gratifications block 2.3%, the habitual media exposure block 11.1%, and the demographic block 5.3%. The strongest strike saliency correlations were significant ($p < .01$) relationships with

saliency of viewing professional football (r = .60), viewing professional football to thrill in winning (r = .45), exposure to televised professional football (r = .39), and viewing activity (r = .38).

Predictors of Player/Owner Support

Media reference foreground variables were less important than demographic variables and labor attitudes in predicting support for either the players or the owners. For both samples, demographic variables account for the largest and labor attitudes the next largest amount of variance in player/owner support.

-----Table 3 about here-----

Of the media reference foreground variables, only viewing the viewing involvement block accounted for a significant amount of variation in player/owner support (2.6%) and this relationship held only for the undergraduates. For the adult males, the strongest play/owner support correlations were significant relationships with race (r = -.47) and support for unions (r = .34). For the undergraduates, the strongest correlations were with race (r = -.27), support for unions (r = .27), and saliency of viewing professional football (r = -.22).

Predictors of Future Football Viewing

Respondents most actively committed to viewing professional football were the least likely to expect the strike to reduce their future professional football viewing.

-----Table 4 about here-----

For the adult males, both the demographic (7.5% of the variance) and viewing involvement (5% of the variance) blocks were significantly related to perceptions of future football viewing behavior. Of the correlations, saliency of viewing professional football was most strongly related (r = -.30). For the undergraduates, the habitual media exposure (9.8% of the variance), the viewing involvement (8.1% of the variance), and the viewing gratifications (3.8% of the variance) blocks were significantly related to perceptions of future football viewing behavior. Viewing to thrill in winning (r = -.41), viewing activity (r = -.37), saliency of viewing (r = -.36), and exposure to televised professional football (r = -.31) were all moderately related to future football viewing.

Discussion

The results of this study provide partial support for the application of the general transactional model to studies of sports and media. For both groups, media reference foreground variable blocks were significantly related to strike saliency and perceptions of future football viewing even after the variance attributed to general background, general foreground, and media reference background blocks was accounted for. Only when player/owner support is used as the criterion variable do media reference foreground variable blocks weaken as predictor variables.

The general background variable of race and the general foreground variable of support for unions were particularly strong predictors of support for either the players or the owners. Blacks and union supporters were more likely to support the players and Whites and union opponents were more likely to support the owners. Despite the unique working conditions and high salaries of professional football players, a respondent's general attitude toward labor unions tends to transfer to player or owner support. The racial differences might be partially explained by the racial composition of the NFL. The high percentage of Black players in the NFL, coupled with the very limited Black representation among coaches, and the lack of Black representation among owners (Eitzen & Yetman, 1979; Rosellini, 1987), may encourage Black support for the NFL Players Association.

In addition to providing support for the Transactional Analysis approach to audience studies of sports and media, the results of this study provided a partial replication of Gantz's (1981) study of sports viewing gratifications. In general, the gratification dimensions identified by Gantz emerged from the factor analyses performed in this study. Differences were limited to a combining of Gantz's watching to thrill in victory and watching to learn dimensions for the undergraduates and the substitution of a watching to socialize dimension for Gantz's watching to let off steam dimension for the adult males.

Also, the use of adult male and undergraduate respondents allowed comparisons of two population samples. The hierarchical regression analyses of these two groups' responses produced similar relationships between the blocks of predictor variables and both player owner/support and strike saliency. Differences between the groups were more evident in regressions performed on perceptions of future football viewing. The tentative conclusion from this comparison is that future studies of gratifications sought from televised sports using undergraduate students may well produce results that can be generalized to the larger group of adult males. Additional research is necessary to strengthen this conclusion.

The 1987 NFL players' strike provided a rare opportunity to evaluate the importance of media gratifications and viewing involvement in the development of audience reactions to a major sports labor conflict that produced gratification denial. As expected, media reference foreground variables were significantly related to the saliency of the strike and expectations about future viewing. However, general background and foreground variables, particularly race and support for labor unions, were more strongly related to support for the players or the owners. Greater degrees of gratifications sought and viewing involvement made viewers perceive both the strike and future viewing as consequential, but did not persuade them to choose one side over the other. For those with "great expectations" of televised professional football, 1987's great "time out" produced participation but not partiality.

Notes

1. Individuals who indicated that they never watch professional football on television were not included in either sample.

2. Since adult males are much more likely to watch professional football on television than adult females (Wenner, 1987: 2), it was decided to maximize the use of limited resources by contacting only adult males for the telephone interview portion of the study.

3. Fourteen adult male respondents were interviewed as part of a pilot study on the evening of October 14, 1987, the evening before the NFL players concluded the strike. Since the only differences between the questionnaires used in the pilot study and the questionnaires used in the main survey were the deletion of some items and a change in the verb tense of some of the items, these 14 respondents were included in the final sample.

4. Since over 90% of the non-white respondents were Black, the racial groups were labeled White and Black. Six household income categories were used: below $12,000, $12,000 to $19,000, $19,000 to $30,000, $30,000 to $40,000, $40,000 to $60,000, and over $60,000 per year.

5. Two of Gantz's behavioral responsiveness items were dropped. One item, yell in anger, was viewed by pilot study respondents as redundant with the item yell in displeasure; the other item, have a beer or a drink, was viewed as unrelated to the game action.

6. To reduce respondent fatigue, three of Gantz's (1981) gratification items were dropped. In Gantz's study, these items had not loaded on any of the gratification factors (to thrill in victory, to let loose, to learn, to pass time). Also, because of confusion evident during a pilot study of the adult males, another gratification item, I enjoy watching because it gets me psyched, was changed to "gets me excited."

7. The one exception to the "half the highest loading" criteria was the loading of the gratification to learn about the players on factor 3 in the analysis of adult males. This gratification had a .59 loading on factor 3 and a .41 loading on factor 1.

8. The ten player/owner attitude items were:

--The football players were wrong to go on strike.

--The striking football players should have been fired and replaced with players who wanted to play.

--The striking players provided a poor model for our young people.

--The players are entitled to all the money they can get because their playing careers are often very short.

--The players are too greedy.

--The NFL owners pay the players a fair wage.

--I was hoping the NFL owners would lose this strike.

--I'm glad the NFL owners stood firm and did not give the players the right to become free agents.

--The NFL owners were unfairly trying to break the players union.

--The strike was the fault of the NFL owners.

References

Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. Communication Research, 6, 9-36.

Bryant, J., Brown, D., Comisky, P. W., & Zillmann, D. (1982). Sports and spectators: Commentary and appreciation. Journal of Communication, 32(1), 109-119.

Bryant, J. & Zillmann, D. (1983). Sports violence and the media. In J. H. Goldstein (Ed.), Sports Violence (195-211). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Celozzi, M. J., Kazelskis, R., & Gutsch, K. U. (1981). The relationship between viewing televised violence in ice hockey and subsequent levels of personal aggression. Journal of Sport Behavior, 4, 157-162.

Comisky, P., Bryant, J., & Zillmann, D. (1977). Commentary as a Substitute for Action. Journal of Communication, 27(3), 150-153.

Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. F. (1949). Knowing and the Known. Boston: Beacon.

Eitzen, D. S. & Yetman, N. R. (1979). Immune from racism? In D. S. Eitzen (Ed.), Sport in Contemporary Society: An Anthology (pp. 388-405). New York: St. Martin's.

Engel, P. G. (1985, January 7). Labor--1985: On the ropes. Industry Week, pp. 21-22.

Frey, J. H. (1983). Survey Research by Telephone. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gantz, W. (1981). An exploration of viewing motives and behaviors associated with television sports. Journal of

Broadcasting, 25, 263-275.

Hastorf, A. H., & Cantril, H. (1954). They saw a game: A case study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 2, 129-134.

Head, S. W., & Sterling, C. H. (1987). Broadcasting in America (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kovach, K. A. (1985). Organized labor's deteriorating condition. Labor Law Journal, 36, 850-856.

Lieber, J. (1987, October 5). A test of unity and loyalty. Sports Illustrated, pp. 41-43

NFL fans are urged to watch college football. (1987, October 4). The Commercial Appeal. p. D-11.

Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A., & Rosengren, K. E. (1985). Uses and gratifications research: The past ten years. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media Gratifications Research (pp. 11-37). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Prisuta, R. H. (1979). Televised sports and political values. Journal of Communication, 29(1), 94-102.

Rosellini, L. (1987). Strike one and you're out. U.S. News and World Report, pp. 52-57.

Sapolsky, B. S. & Zillmann, D. (1978). Enjoyment of a televised sport contest under different social conditions of viewing. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 46, 29-30.

Strike prompts a 'wish list' from an angry football fan. (1987, September 27). The Commercial Appeal. p. D-11.

Wenner, L. A. (1987, May). Media, sports, and society: An

agenda for communication research. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.

Wenner, L. A. (1985). Transaction and media gratifications research. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (eds.), Media Gratifications Research (pp. 73-94). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Woodworth, W. (1985). Unionbusting: The corporate assault on organized labor. Business and Society Review, 52, 15-19.

Zillmann, D., Bryant, J., & Sapolsky, B.S. (1977). The enjoyment of watching sports contests. In J. H. Goldstein (Ed.), Sports, Games and Play (pp.297-335). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Table 1
Factor Analyses Viewing Gratifications Sought

Adult Males	F1	F2	F3	F4
You feel good when your team wins	.80	.12	.21	.00
You enjoy rooting for your team	.77	.17	.20	-.12
It gets you excited	.59	.09	.29	.00
To see who wins	.55	.06	.11	.07
Because that's what your family or friends are watching	.00	.78	.11	.08
It's something to do with your friends	.10	.65	.17	.05
It's something to do with your family	.08	.55	.08	.00
Gives you an opportunity to have a few beers or drinks	.12	.42	.04	.02
To learn about the game	.24	.16	.70	-.11
To learn about the players	.41	.09	.59	-.12
Gives you something to talk about	.26	.19	.58	.21
Nothing else on and you enjoy watching TV	.00	.11	.02	.69
Nothing else to do at the time	-.03	.01	-.01	.68
Percentage of Variance Accounted for	25.9	10.4	6.7	4.1

Undergraduates	F1	F2	F3
You enjoy rooting for your team	.82	.07	.17
You feel good when your team wins	.82	.09	.18
To see who wins	.79	.12	.16
It gets you excited	.70	.01	.32
To learn about the players	.64	.07	.19
To learn about the game	.53	.11	.19
Because that's what your family or friends are watching	.07	.70	.04
Nothing else to do at the time	.03	.64	.04
Nothing else on and you enjoy watching TV	.02	.62	.09
To let off steam	.21	-.02	.67
Gives you an opportunity to have a few beers or drinks	.17	.16	.42
Percentage of Variance Accounted for	32.7	10.2	3.7

TABLE 2
Simple and Multiple Correlations and Beta Weights for Predictors of Strike Saliency

	Adult Males (n = 183)			Undergraduates (n = 339)		
	r	R	Beta	r	R	Beta
General Background: Demographic Variables						
Age	-.14	.14	-.07	-.07	.07	.01
Sex (1=Female, 2=Male)				.22*	.23	.08
Education	-.16	.22	-.07			
Income	-.03	.22	.07	.03	.23	.05
Race (1=White, 2=Black)	.31*	.34	.16	.00	.23	-.01
General Foreground: Labor Attitudes						
Ideology	.00	.34	.05	.00	.23	-.01
Support for Unions	.09	.34	.04	.10	.27	.15*
Media Reference Background: Habitual Media Exposure						
TV Viewing	.09	.34	-.05	.08	.28	-.01
Football Viewing	.18	.37	.01	.39*	.43	.04
Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Involvement						
Football Saliency	.45*	.51	.36*	.60*	.62	.45*
Viewing Activity	.24*	.51	.01	.38*	.62	-.06
Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Gratifications Sought						
To Thrill in Winning	.18	.52	-.19	.45*	.63	.21*
To Watch with Others	.20*	.54	.14			
To Learn about the Game	.39*	.57	.23*			
To Let Loose				.19*	.63	-.01
To Pass Time	-.14	.58	-.11	-.13	.64	-.12*
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:						
Demographic Variables			.117*			.053*
Labor Attitudes			.001			.018
Habitual Media Exposure			.016			.111*
Viewing Involvement			.128*			.202*
Viewing Gratifications Sought			.069*			.023*
Total Variance Accounted for:			.331*			.407*

*Significant at $p < .01$.

TABLE 3
Simple and Multiple Correlations and Beta Weights for Predictors of Player/Owner Support Scale**

	Adult Males (n = 183)			Undergraduates (n = 339)		
	r	R	Beta	r	R	Beta
General Background: Demographic Variables						
Age	.14	.14	.07	.03	.03	-.05
Sex (1=Female, 2=Male)				-.03	.04	-.04
Education	.12	.19	-.02			
Income	.19*	.25	.01	-.05	.06	-.16*
Race (1=White, 2=Black)	-.47*	.48	-.41*	.33*	.34	-.27*
General Foreground: Labor Attitudes						
Ideology	.06	.48	-.06	.10	.36	.07
Support for Unions	-.34*	.53	-.23*	-.33*	.44	-.27*
Media Reference Background: Habitual Media Exposure						
TV Viewing	-.19*	.53	-.06	-.13	.44	-.03
Football Viewing	.10	.55	.10	-.05	.44	.03
Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Involvement						
Football Saliency	-.04	.55	.01	-.15*	.47	-.22*
Viewing Activity	-.08	.55	-.09	-.02	.47	.04
Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Gratifications Sought						
To Thrill in Winning	.03	.57	.20	-.04	.47	.05
To Watch with Others	-.03	.57	-.04			
To Learn about the Game	-.18	.57	-.06			
To Let Loose				-.07	.47	-.06
To Pass Time	-.10	.58	-.10	.05	.48	.05
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:						
Demographic Variables			.227*			.118*
Labor Attitudes			.054*			.074*
Habitual Media Exposure			.022			.003
Viewing Involvement			.001			.026*
Viewing Gratifications Sought			.029			.006
Total Variance Accounted for:			.333*			.228*

*Significant at $p < .01$.
**A low scale number means support for the players. A high scale number means support for the owners.

TABLE 4

Simple and Multiple Correlations and Beta Weights for Predictors of Future Football Viewing

	Adult Males (n = 183)			Undergraduates (n = 339)		
	r	R	Beta	r	R	Beta
General Background: Demographic Variables						
Age	.06	.06	.03	.09	.09	.02
Sex (1=Female, 2=Male)				-.03	.09	.06
Education	-.14	.15	-.25*			
Income	-.04	.15	-.04	.05	.11	.04
Race (1=White, 2=Black)	-.18	.27	-.14	-.04	.12	-.01
General Foreground: Labor Attitudes						
Ideology	.01	.28	-.02	.01	.12	.00
Support for Unions	-.12	.29	-.13	-.11	.15	-.11
Media Reference Background: Habitual Media Exposure						
TV Viewing	-.06	.29	.05	-.06	.16	.03
Football Viewing	-.18	.35	-.09	-.31*	.35	-.10
Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Involvement						
Football Saliency	-.30*	.42	-.25*	-.36*	.41	-.12
Viewing Activity	-.10	.42	.07	-.37*	.45	-.14
Media Reference Foreground: Viewing Gratifications Sought						
To Thrill in Winning	-.14	.42	-.02	-.41*	.47	-.25*
To Watch with Others	-.04	.42	-.02			
To Learn about the Game	-.14	.42	-.06			
To Let Loose				-.05	.49	.16*
To Pass Time	.11	.42	.04	-.07	.49	-.03
Variance Accounted for by Each Block:						
Demographic Variables			.075*			.014
Labor Attitudes			.009			.009
Habitual Media Exposure			.039			.098*
Viewing Involvement			.050*			.081*
Viewing Gratifications Sought			.005			.038*
Total Variance Accounted for:			.178*			.239*

*Significant at p < .01.